THE IMPORTANCE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN LINGUISTICS

Anvarbekova Shoira Anvarbek qizi
Uzbekistan State University of World languages 1st year student of Master's degree

Discourse has not yet received an unambiguous definition, due to the polysemy and ambiguity of the content. It is difficult to talk about proper terminological status of discourse and the name 'discourse', it remains a protermin and in order to turn it into a full-valued term, it is needed to include discourse in the system of connections of some research paradigm. Two paradigms in linguistics with formalist paradigm and functionalist paradigm make different background assumptions about the aims of a linguistic theory, the methods for studying language, and the nature of data and empirical evidence. These different approaches in paradigm also influence definitions of discourse. A definition as derived from formalist assumptions is that discourse is 'language above the sentence or above the clause'. Another definition derived from the functionalist paradigm views discourse as 'language use'. This definition examines the relationship between the discourse and the context.

Linguists have gained a considerable understanding of the language works by looking at real, authentic discourse and its relationship to context. Within the applied dimension of linguistics, McCarthy, Matthiessen, and Slade point out that 'The important position that discourse analysis occupies in applied linguistics has come about because it enables applied linguists to analyze and understand real language data' [1]. The language data that applied linguists analyze can be either written or spoken, and one thing they have learned through the studies of discourse is that spoken language is no less structured than written language. Discourse analysis focuses on language in use: written text of all kinds and spoken data. It became popular in different disciplines in the 1960s and early 1970s, including linguistics, semiotics, anthropology, psychology and sociology. When linguistics was largely concerned with the analysis of single sentences, Zelling Harris published his paper 'Discourse analysis' in 1952. Harris was interested in the British discourse analysis was noticeably influenced by M.A. Halliday's functional approach to language, which in turn has connections with the Prague School of linguists. Halliday's framework emphasizes the social functions of language and the thematic and informational structure of speech and writing [3]. Another important in Britain were Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) at the University of Birmingham, who developed a model for the description of teacher pupil talk, based on a hierarchy of discourse units. Other similar work has dealt with doctor-patient interaction, service encounters, interviews, debates and business negotiations, as well as monologues. The British work has principally followed structural-linguistic criteria, based on the isolation of units, and sets of rules defining well-formed sequences of discourse.

American discourse analysis has been dominated by work within the ethnomethodical tradition, which emphasizes the research method of close observation of groups of people communicating in natural setting. It investigates types of speech event such as storytelling, greeting rituals and verbal duels in

different cultural and social settings. It is often called conversion analysis within the American tradition can also be included under the general heading of discourse analysis. In conversational analysis, the emphasis is not upon building structural models but on the close observation of the behavior of participants in talk and on patterns which recur over a wide range of natural data. The work of Goffman, Sacks Schegloff, and Jefferson is important in the study of conversational norms, turn-taking, and other aspects of spoken interaction. Alongside the conservation analysts, working within the sociolinguistic tradition, Labov's investigations of oral storytelling have also contributed to a long history of interest in narrative discourse [4]. The American work has produced a large number of descriptions of discourse types as well as approaches into the social constraints of politeness and face-preserving phenomena in conversation, overlapping with British work in pragmatics.

The study of the principles of classification and typology of discourse in the modern Russian language cognition is a topic that was developed in the works of N.D. Arutyunova, V.G. Borborotka, V.S. Grigorieva, M.L. Makarov, and M.Yu. Oleshkov. Makarov emphasized that any language is a dual entity: it is always a kind of semiotic system and at the same time means of communication [5]. The predominant focus on the study of sign or functional properties of the language determines the presence in linguistic science of two paradigms: system-structural and communicative, to which discourseology belongs, which grew out of communicative linguistics.

The present article dwelled on disciplines tend to concentrate on different aspects of discourse. How discourse analysis is dealt with the structure of social interaction manifested in conversation has been pointed out in this study. Discourse plays different roles in different social contexts. But when conversation is more casual, and among equals, everyone will have part to play is monitoring the discourse, and the phenomenon of discourse may look more complicated. All in all, discourse analysis helps not only a speaker or writer to select right choices of words, syntax and utterances depending on particular situations, also it supports a hearer or reader to interpret the right meaning of discourse.

REFERENCES:
1. McCarthy M., Matthiessen C. M.I.M., & Slade D. (2010). Discourse analysis. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), An introduction to applied linguistics (2nd ed.) PP. 53–54. London: Routledge.
2. Harris Z.S. (1952). Discourse analysis: Language, 1952. vol. 28, PP. 10–30.
3. Halliday M.A., and J.R. Martin. 1993. Writing science: Literacy and discourse power. London: Falmer Press.
4. Labov W. and Flanshel D. (1977) Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation. New York: Academic Press.
5. Makarov M. L. (2003). Basics of the Theory of Discourse, Moscow: Gnozis, PP. 281–282. (In Russian).